

**MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 29, 2003**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on September 2, 2003 at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Nesbitt in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None.

STAFF PRESENT: Reg Murray, Associate Planner; Janet Ferro, Administrative Secretary

ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

ITEM II: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM III: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of August 9, 2003 were approved as amended. The minutes of September 2, 2003 were approved as submitted.

ITEM IV: PUBLIC COMMENT

None

ITEM V: PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. Ordinance Amendment for Design Review and Historic Preservation.** The City of Auburn proposes to revise the Zoning Ordinance by adopting a Design Review Ordinance and a Historic Preservation Ordinance, thereby replacing Article 8 (Design Control) of the current ordinance. The Design Review Ordinance clarifies the development procedures for the City and the Historic Preservation Ordinance provides for the protection of historic properties within the Historic Design Review District and establishes the procedures and responsibilities re-

lated to development within the district. The Zoning Ordinance sections being amended include: 9-4.115; 9-4.517; 9-8 (801-819); 9-4.1005; 9-4.1006, and 9-4.1009.

Associate Planner Reg Murray gave the staff report, reviewing the background information on this item. In 1998, the City Council appointed a task force to review the design guidelines as well as the City's ordinance relating to historic design review. The task force developed a "Historic Preservation Ordinance" to address design review in the historic area, and also updated the design guidelines. Later the City Council disbanded the task force directing staff to complete the project, and staff has now finalized preparation of the documents for public review. Staff believed that the design review procedure would be easier to work with if the process for general design review and the process for historic design review were distinctly separate, and consequently has separated the two and developed two ordinances. He reviewed the salient points of the information submitted for this workshop.

Planner Murray pointed out that with respect to the historic area, he felt the largest issue that the Commission will deal with would be residential design review. As presented by the task force, design review would be required for single-family, two-family and tri-plex development, with two-family and tri-plex development reviewed under the non-residential standards. The addition of single-family residential design review in the historic area has new standards that have been added to the design guidelines and this is probably the most significant change to the zoning guidelines. Those standards would be required under the following circumstances: New construction; additions that increase building square footage by 100% or more; and major design alterations.

Murray also noted that the task force identified five outlying residential areas that they felt were important to the City. He reviewed the location of these areas for the Commission, as the other issue for their review is whether design review should be required for single-family residential in these areas, and if so, to what standards.

The public hearing was opened.

Shirley Bell, 435 Lincoln Way, stated that property-owners rights should be considered, she did not want a task force telling her what to do on her property.

Terry Cook, 1240 Grove Court, spoke on behalf of California Association of Business, Property and Resource Owners (CABPRO) and also as a property owner. She stated strong opposition to any designation of a structure without the permission of the current property owner. She believed that any district designated for design review would, de facto, become a historic district and owners in that area would have to comply. She asked that each property owner who would be directly affected by this proposed ordinance be notified, and would also like a schedule of hearings planned. She requested a copy of the map showing the five residential areas planned for design review, and urged that single family residences be excluded.

Planner Murray pointed out that all property owners within the historic district as well as property owners within all five of the contemplated residential areas were notified; future Commission hearings will not be re-noticed as future meetings will be continued to a specific date.

The Commissioners agreed that future meeting notices should be provided to the Auburn Journal with a request for publication in the "FYI" section.

Bridget Barnes, local attorney and also a member of Placer CABPRO felt noticing of this meeting was inadequate and suggested additional noticing of future meetings. She noted commercial requirements that she felt would not be economically feasible for small business owners. She also noted the suggestion that the current design review ordinance requiring a design review permit for additions of 20% or more be reduced to 10%. She stated that she and her organization (CABPRO) would oppose a reduction to such a small percentage, because of the comparison between the benefits conferred on the City vs. the impact on the property owner. She stated it is difficult for a property owner, residential or commercial, to comply with requirements and she would caution against reducing the percentage at which it would trigger compliance.

Planner Murray pointed out that staff's recommendation was for a reiteration of the current standard and any change would be made by the Planning Commission. He also pointed out that over 900 property owners in the Auburn area were notified by mail of this public hearing, that the notice was posted at City Hall and placed in the legal notice section of the Auburn Journal.

Ian Hammer, local realtor, spoke about property owner rights and sale viability if restrictions are imposed.

Lynn Carpenter, business owner at 127-135 Sacramento Street, member of the original task force and current chairman of the Historic Design Review Committee (HDRC), advised that the term “true colors” mentioned earlier referred to colors that had not been pearlized, iridized, or in any way modified from the original pure color. She stated that if colors were limited to true colors a homeowner or businessowner would have a selection of many colors to choose from.

Tim Busk, local contractor active in building restoration, stated he liked the guidelines proposed. He offered his services as a restoration consultant.

Sandra Elder, HDRC member very active in historic preservation, had several helpful suggestions for the Commissioners in their review of the Historic Preservation Ordinance. She also noted that there is a building code for historic buildings that is less stringent in some areas of commercial construction.

Comm. Smith asked if an information sheet could be provided that would advise the public of what would not be required. Comm. McCord suggested that the information sheet could also include what is required.

Kathy Richardson, commercial property owner at 229 Sacramento Street, suggested that the requirements be simplified from what they are now, with better communication between City staff, committee members, architects and property owners.

Comer Knowles, 210 Oak Street, stated that although he did receive a notice about this public hearing he felt that future public hearings should be better publicized, as well as the final outcome of the hearings.

Ross Carpenter, co-owner of the business at 127-135 Sacramento Street, said he believes there is a lack of communication with the public and he would like to see a brochure produced that lists the pro’s and the con’s, especially for residential areas.

Hal Beck, 198 Pine Street, appreciated being notified of the public hearing and would appreciate any additional notification in the future.

Donna Howell, 405 Linden Avenue, has been involved with several historical organizations. She agrees with the need for historic preservation and would like to see information made available so that the public knows that the historic preservation ordinance would only come up when someone made significant changes to the outside of their building. The ordinance is to

help people and not to deter them from beautifying the outside of their residence or business.

Michael Murphy, local architect, supports the need for historical design review and that an ordinance is needed for larger projects to maintain the character of the community.

The Chairman called for a 10-minute recess.
The meeting reconvened at 8:40 p.m.

Shirley Bell returned to the lectern to state that the public hearing notice she received was difficult to understand and she suggested that the brochure that is compiled should be written more clearly. She also inquired as to what criteria is being used to determine what buildings are to be considered historical.

Attorney Bridget Barnes returned to point out that there seemed to be definite distinctions between the downtown and old town Auburn areas, and that there appeared to be a lot of concern about the possible imposition on residential homes. She also noted concerns with the proposed expansion into five areas, and how the ordinance would be applied. She outlined three issues: geographic issues, historic context, and mandatory vs. suggested proposals or guidelines.

The public hearing was closed.

Comm. Smith agreed with the suggestions of Attorney Barnes, and would also like to see in a brochure what the historic preservation ordinance covers and also what it does not cover, and would like an outline to be provided listing what will be covered in the upcoming meetings. He would also like informative publicity on future meetings.

The Commissioners discussed what specific topics to cover at the next public hearing. Staff will send information on the next meeting to the Auburn Journal requesting publication in the "FYI" section of the newspaper.

The next public hearing on the ordinances will be Wednesday, October 15, 2003 at 6:30 p.m. The main topic to be discussed will be Chapter VII of the draft Historic Preservation Architectural Design Guidelines, specifically the Residential Design Guidelines. Discussion will include the criteria upon which 5 proposed areas were chosen; pros and cons of owning a historic building; mandatory vs. suggested guidelines; and what is and is not covered by the ordinances.

**ITEM VI: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
FOLLOW-UP REPORTS**

A. City Council Meetings

Planner Murray reviewed recent City Council meetings.

B. Future Planning Commission Meetings

The next Planning Commission meeting will be October 7, 2003.

C. Reports

None

ITEM VII: PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS

None.

ITEM VIII: FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

None.

ITEM IX: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Elaine Ferro, Administrative Secretary